

II. REMARKS

Figures 1-13 are amended to include the legend "Prior Art" as required by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Figures 14-16 are amended to provide legends for the symbolically illustrated structures in these Figures as required by the Examiner in the Office Action. No new matter is added.

The Specification is amended to clarify which objects are achieved by which aspects of the invention.

The terms "display screen", "movement related signal receiver", "voice output device", "delimit device", "activation area", "sensor signal", and "selection device" listed in the amendments to the Specification have been added to the claims by various amendments and were not present in the Specification as originally filed. These amendments to the Specification insure that terms in the claims have a basis in the Specification, in accordance with MPEP §608.01(o). No new matter is added.

Claims 119-122 and 169 are each amended to refer not to the apparatus of the parent claim, but instead to the voice output system of the parent claim.

Claim 132 is amended to add an eye tracker to the claim's list of pointers.

New claim 170 is based on claim 1, replaces the means plus function language of claim 1 with component language, and uses the term "display screen" in lieu of "display area", as found in claim 1, as amended. Since claim 1 has been examined in the present application, so too should claim 170.

Claims 170-202 are new.

Each of the new and amended claims reads on the elected species. No new matter is added.

The Examiner stated in our telephone interview on 15 July 1997 that each of the independent claims 1, 94, 106, and 114 as amended in Applicant Document No. 032-14 overcomes the Baker and Bronson references. Claims 107 and 108 each depend directly from claim 1, each further limits its parent claim, and each was withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Applicant requests that the Examiner reinstate and allow these dependent claims. Claims 113, 115-133, and 169 each depend directly or indirectly from one of the listed independent claims, each further limits its respective parent claim, and each was rejected by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicant requests that the Examiner allow these dependent claims and each of the listed independent claims.

At the close of the 15 July 1997 telephone interview and again in a telephone conversation on 1 October 1997, the Examiner refused to schedule an appointment with Applicant to further discuss the merits of the case. Consequently, Applicant has no indication of whether, in the Examiner's opinion,

Bronson is pertinent to claims other than those discussed on 15 July 1997.

Favorable reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.



Respectfully submitted,

Donald K. Forest

Applicant

10 Date: 31 October 1997

209 Croydon Ave.

Rockville, MD 20850-4145

Phone (301) 251-1108

15 Fax (301) 251-6299

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231, on 31 October 1997.

Donald K. Forest

31 October 1997

Date of Signing